



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/584,445	06/22/2006	Elie Leverd	3493-0170PUS1	4148

2292 7590 07/29/2009  
BIRCH STEWART KOLASCH & BIRCH  
PO BOX 747  
FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747

EXAMINER
----------

THOMAS, TIMOTHY P

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1614

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-------------------	---------------

07/29/2009

ELECTRONIC

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

mailroom@bskb.com

<b>Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/584,445	<b>Applicant(s)</b> LEVERD ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> TIMOTHY P. THOMAS	<b>Art Unit</b> 1614	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) TIMOTHY P. THOMAS. (3) \_\_\_\_.

(2) Andrew Meikle. (4) \_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 21 July 2009.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.  
If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: GlaxoSmithKline ("Prescribing Information: Navelbine (vinorelbine tartrate) Injection: 2002 Nov; pp. 1-17; IDS 1/22/2008 reference CA); and Duflos et al. (US 6,127,377; 2000; IDS 10/4/2006 reference AB).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The figure was discussed; the version filed 10/23/2008 now shows 7 sets of data, and will overcome the objection of record. The rejection under 35 USC 103 based on the combination of GlaxoSmithKline and Duflos was discussed with potential approaches to overcoming the rejection, including potential claim amendments or information in a 132 Declaration..

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Timothy P Thomas/ Examiner, Art Unit 1614	
---	--